

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheet of drawings includes a change to Figure 1. This sheet, which includes Figure 1, replaces the original sheet that included Figure 1. In Figure 1, descriptive labeling has been added for elements 12, 14, 16, 18 and 22.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants thank the Examiner for review of the present application as evidenced by the Office Action dated October 16, 2006. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the objections and rejections contained therein.

Claim 20 has been amended by this Response. Claims 1-20 are currently pending in the application. No new matter has been entered by this Response.

The Examiner objected to the drawings, and specifically because box-type drawing elements in Figure 1 lack descriptive labeling. Applicants have amended Figure 1 herewith to respond to this objection. A replacement Sheet 1 is attached hereto, in which descriptive labeling has been added to drawing elements 12, 14, 16, 18 and 22 in Figure 1. The added descriptive labeling is consistent with the identification of these elements on page 8 of the specification. No new matter has been added herewith.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. With respect to independent claims 1 and 7, the Examiner states it is unclear in context what is meant by the method step of 'combining the first and second representations to form a three-dimensional model of the weather event' as opposed to the method step of 'constructing a ... shape....' With respect to independent claim 19, the Examiner states it is unclear in context what is meant by the 'processor' acting to generate 'a three-dimensional model' as opposed to the 'display' rendering a three-dimensional shape. In response, applicants refer the Examiner to the specification and drawings, which clearly discuss the differences between the step of forming a model and the step of constructing a shape. For example, page 13 lines 1-3 discuss the combining of shape descriptors 62 and 68 to form a three-dimensional model 70, as shown in Figure 8. Then, as described at page 13 lines 4-9, a linear or curve-fitting algorithm is applied to the edges and various reflectivity regions of the shape descriptors in the model to form a three-dimensional shape 72 that is then rendered on a 3-D display. In other words, forming a model is a step in which shape descriptors are combined, and forming or constructing a shape is a step in which the model is prepared for 3-D display. The difference between these two steps is also discussed on pages 10-11 with respect to Figure 5, and at other places within the specification as well.

Applicants believe this explanation is sufficient to differentiate the steps of 'forming a three-dimensional model of the weather event' and 'constructing a ... shape ...' as recited in independent claims 1 and 7 as well as similar language in independent claim 19. Applicants therefore request the Examiner to remove the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Applicants thank the Examiner for stating that claims 1-20 contain allowable subject matter. Accordingly, as the difference between forming a model and constructing a shape has been clearly explained, thereby removing all rejections to the claims, all pending claims are now allowable, and a notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if further issues remain in the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,


Nathan O. Jensen
Reg. No. 41,460
Attorney for Applicant

Rockwell Collins Inc.
Intellectual Property Department
400 Collins Road NE M/S 124-323
Cedar Rapids, IA 52498
Telephone: (319) 295-1184
Facsimile No. (319) 295-8777
Customer No.: 26383